

Fulbright Assails Reports Of Submarine Base on Cuba

WASHINGTON, Oct. 4 (UPI)—Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, charged today that the Administration was "hoodwinking the American people" by warning of possible construction of a Soviet submarine base in Cuba. He also said there was "little doubt" that the United States maintains nuclear weapons at sites bordering the Soviet Union.

The Arkansas Democrat said, in an interview, that Defense Department officials who briefed his senate committee last week not only had no evidence that a submarine base was under construction, but did not even try to convince the committee that it was.

He said the department's public disclosure of intelligence data showing some sort of construction activity at Cienfuegos, on Cuba's southern coast, was designed to "alarm" Americans to spur Congress to approve generous appropriations for the Pentagon.

S16808

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 30, 1970

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 340 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allen	Ellender	Pearson
Allott	Ervin	Prouty
Anderson	Fannin	Russell
Baker	Fong	Saxbe
Bible	Fulbright	Scott
Boggs	Griffin	Smith, Maine
Cook	Gurney	Spong
Cooper	Hansen	Talmadge
Cotton	Holland	Thurmond
Curtis	Hollings	Williams, Del.
Dole	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Long	
Eastland	McClellan	

NAYS—29

Bayh	Hughes	Nelson
Brooke	Jackson	Packwood
Burdick	Javits	Pastore
Case	Kennedy	Percy
Church	Manfield	Proxmire
Cranston	Mathias	Schweiker
Eagleton	McGovern	Stevens
Gore	McIntyre	Symington
Hart	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Hatfield	Mondale	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, for.
Mr. Randolph, for.

NOT VOTING—32

Aiken	Hruska	Muskie
Bellmon	Inouye	Pell
Bennett	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Smith, Ill.
Cannon	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dodd	McGee	Stennis
Goldwater	Miller	Tower
Goodell	Montoya	Tydings
Gravel	Moss	Yarborough
Harris	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Murphy	

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendment No. 976 was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BRIEFING ON SOVIET SUBMARINE BASES IN CUBA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, of which I am chairman, will receive an intelligence briefing on the reports we have had of the construction of a Russian submarine base in Cuba.

Senators will recall that the last reports we had of Soviet military activities in Cuba led to one of the crucial crises of our generation.

I do not know whether the present situation is of such significance as the earlier confrontation in Cuba, but I believe that it is essential that Senators know precisely what the situation is, so that we need not rely on press reports and rumors.

The briefing tomorrow afternoon will be conducted by members of the Defense Intelligence Agency in room S-116 at 2:30 p.m. and any Senator who is interested is invited to attend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of an editorial on this

subject, published in this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET SUB BASE IN CUBA?

It is curious that neither Moscow nor Havana has reacted publicly to the White House warning against construction of a Soviet strategic submarine base in Cuba. On occasion in the past the Soviet Government has been quick to deny much less serious accusations appearing even in obscure publications. But in this case, when a White House spokesman raised the possibility that the Kremlin had secretly begun work that would violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the 1962 Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement, there has not been a word of Soviet comment.

Pessimists will conclude that this silence confirms Washington's worst fears. Optimists will argue that Soviet leaders are taking another look at whatever plans may be underway for the Cuban port of Cienfuegos and have not yet decided what to do in the light of the White House statement.

The world was probably closer to thermonuclear war during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 than at any time before or since. In reporting the agreement which had resolved the crisis, President Kennedy said that the Soviet leaders had promised to remove all "weapons systems capable of offensive use" and "to halt the further introduction of such systems into Cuba." In return the United States agreed to lift its naval quarantine and to "give assurances against an invasion of Cuba." President Kennedy was thinking of land-based missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons, but submarines having similar missiles and nuclear weapons are also "weapons systems capable of offensive use."

Violations of this understanding, coming on top of the current Soviet violations of the cease-fire pact in the Suez Canal zone, would certainly undermine any confidence in agreements with the Soviet Union. In this situation any Soviet move to create a submarine base in Cuba would only intensify tension between the two superpowers and strengthen retrogressive forces in both countries that would intensify the arms race.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3730) to extend for 1 year the act of September 30, 1965, as amended by the act of July 24, 1968, relating to high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 110) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3154) to provide long-term financing for expanded urban mass transportation programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14485) to

amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 236) authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the week of August 1 through August 7 as "National Clown Week."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1154) authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 675) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the conquest of cancer as a national crusade.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17604) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIVERS, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. BRAY, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. KING, and Mr. FOREMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 18126) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for holding district court for the eastern district of New York at Westbury, N.Y., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3558) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide continued financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES ENFORCEMENT ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 2453) to further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers.

AMENDMENTS NO. 978

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I call up my amendments No. 978.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated by the clerk.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

happen to be a Senator of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Those people who are not competitive in the civil service.

Mr. ERVIN. That is section 715.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. They are not covered. This is further evidence that section 715 should be separate and apart and on its own.

Mr. ERVIN. Then I understand the distinguished Senator correctly to say the provisions of the bill do not apply to the Federal Government, anything except section 715—any officer of the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is right.

Mr. ERVIN. That satisfies me on that point. I am not asking these questions to be facetious but I have been so busy—as indeed has every other Member of the Senate—these harried days, that I could not get around to doing all my homework and I got to this just last night.

I thank the Senator for his information.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself, I would not have traded this legal exercise for anything.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am almost ready to vote. For the information of those who have not had the opportunity to be present, my amendment would leave in the Civil Service Commission the Federal employees. Instead of transferring that portion of personnel management to the EEOC, it would leave it in the Civil Service Commission.

This has been recommended by the Chairman of the EEOC, Mr. Brown, and by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Hampton.

Why in the world we would take 3 million Federal employees and take one portion of personnel management and put it in a whole new agency, I cannot understand.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, would the Senator answer a question for me if he is able to do so? What would be the rationale of the committee in exempting the employees of Senators? How would we justify that?

Mr. DOMINICK. I think that we did not get around to it at all. Actually, I would presume it is a pretty subtle distinction, because they are Federal employees, but they are not under civil service. The only ones covered were the employees under civil service. I do not see why they should have been exempted, but they were.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe that we covered those now covered under the Executive order. It was to be limited to that group, rather than broadening it beyond the Executive order as it exists.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be a difficult point to explain. Apparently we would be interested in bringing all other employers under the jurisdiction of the EEOC with respect to guarantees against discrimination, but we would leave ourselves free to discriminate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if Congress votes for this legislation, I think

we have a right to assume that Congress will in its personal conduct act in good faith. I think there is great jealousy over Executive interference with our functions and having any executive function in the executive department have the power to deal with the respective exercise of the Members of Congress. I respect that balancing of the two equities. Even if we had done this in an advised way, I would still omit those employees because the separation of powers is, in my opinion, so critical that we should not jeopardize that concept with an executive department agency.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado, the sponsor of the amendment—since I did not hear all of the debate—do I correctly understand that the EEOC and the Civil Service Commission would favor the amendment of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. DOMINICK. The Senator is correct. Chairman Brown of the EEOC and the chairman of the Civil Service Commission both testified in support of what my amendment would do—in other words, not transfer jurisdiction.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I certainly hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word. The Senator from Colorado was very sparing in taking time. I am going with the committee on the whole bill.

My reason for supporting this particular provision of the bill is that there is, in my judgment, a proper case to be made for the fact that the agency which handles the personnel policies—namely, the Civil Service Commission—should not also be its own supervisor with respect to discrimination in employment.

It is for that reason that I saw some sense—I was not passionate about it, but I saw some sense—in giving rulemaking and the review power to the EEOC, so that it may make a consistent nondiscriminatory policy both in the Federal Government and in the State and local governments and for private employers.

I submit that the rationale of the committee's action is that it represents a sanction outside of the operation of the personnel policy of the Civil Service Commission itself. Experience has demonstrated, because of the very setup, that the personnel practice—the type of examination, and so forth—seems to open the door to discrimination.

I, therefore, think this is a healthy correction that is being made.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation. The EEOC can give an applicant for employment with the State government \$1,000 to litigate his case. But under the explanation that has been given, they cannot give 1 cent to an applicant for Federal employment. I do not see why we make that discrimination between the Federal Government and the State agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Having already voted in the affirmative, I now withdraw my vote.

Mr. RANDOLPH (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE). If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." I have already voted "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTANA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOOD-ELL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is paired with the Senator from New York (Mr. GOOD-ELL). If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

Rivers Cites Soviet Power In New Defense Fund Plea

By JOHN W. FINNEY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 28—Representative L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, today fired the opening shot in the House battle over the defense budget with a warning that the nation was in "terrible jeopardy" because of rising Soviet military power.

Unless the "deterioration in our military capability" is reversed, Mr. Rivers said, he foresaw the United States being "pushed out" of the Mediterranean, forced to accept a Soviet submarine base in Cuba and eventually unable to deter Soviet aggression.

"We are on the brink of disaster" and "the future of this nation hangs by a threat," the South Carolina Democrat declared in a long, grim speech.

"We seem hell-bent on national suicide," he said, as he spoke from a text. "While we debate the question of maintaining our military capability, the Soviet Union quietly but openly forges ahead."

The Rivers speech came at a time when the House Appropriations Committee was beginning to consider the proposed \$71-billion defense bill for the present fiscal year of 1971.

Previous Clash on Cuts

Mr. Rivers clashed with the Appropriations Committee last year over cuts made in the defense budget. One apparent purpose of his speech was to ward off further reductions in the defense bill by the committee this year.

Another concern of Mr. Rivers is that the Appropria-

tions Committee provide additional money for naval ship construction. At his initiative, the military procurement authorization bill, approved last week by a Senate-House conference committee, provides \$435-million more than requested by the Administration for naval shipbuilding. But the Appropriations Committee has yet to put up the money to carry out this authorization.

As he began his 32-page speech, Mr. Rivers said:

"Never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this house with greater concern for the future of this nation."

"My critics, who are legion, will attempt to dismiss what I say today by categorizing them as the shrill cries of a hawk who is suffering the agonies of reduced defense expenditures."

"If this occurs, I will have failed my purpose since I believe that these critics, who love America no less than I, will, if they assess my words carefully, find that we not only have a common concern, but a common and frightening peril."

'Defense Budgeteered' Scored

Much of the speech was an analysis of how the United States was "fast becoming a second-rate naval power" because of "the past unwillingness of defense budgeteers to provide for a modern navy."

With its growing sea power, Mr. Rivers said, the Soviet Union "is inexorably pushing us out of the Mediterranean, is firmly entrenched in the Indian Ocean and is now established in the Caribbean."

In more emphatic terms than those used by Administration officials in recent days when the issue was first discussed publicly, Mr. Rivers said there was "no doubt" that the Russians were building a naval base in Cuba for nuclear-powered submarines capable of launching missiles.

Administration officials have expressed concern about Soviet activities at Cienfuegos Bay on Cuba's southern coast, but have not stated that a submarine base is under construction.

Mr. Rivers urged that the United States "take every diplomatic, and if necessary military, step" to eliminate such a base.

Quick Action Urged

"We must do it quickly and decisively if we are to maintain some shred of credibility as a world power," he said. "and the American people are willing to accept any action to accomplish this end."

"We don't have any alternative," he went on. "It's either

fish or cut bait. The worst mistake we ever made was when we didn't occupy Cuba in 1962."

Contending that the United States is confronted with "a crisis of the same gravity" as when the Soviet Union attempted to install land-based missiles in Cuba in 1962, Mr. Rivers said, "We cannot live with this new Soviet threat at our very doorstep," making "cities of the Eastern Seaboard become hostages of the Soviet Union."

In the Senate, meanwhile, Senator Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, announced that the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemispheric Affairs would hold a closed hearing shortly to review the "potentially serious development" in Cuba.

"If necessary, we must act in timely fashion, if we are to avoid that kind of nuclear showdown that occurred eight years ago," Senator Church said in a brief speech.